

City of Buckley

Millie Judge, Hearing Examiner
City of Buckley
933 Main Street P.O. Box 1960
Buckley WA 98321
(360) 829-1921

FINAL DECISION OF THE HEARING EXAMINER

CASE SUMMARY

PROJECT NAME: Heritage House Buckley, LLC - Memory Care Facility

FILE NO. CSP 2011-01

APPLICANT/ LANDOWNER: Heritage House Buckley, LLC
c/o Marvin Pratt
4110 Pacific Avenue, #200
Forest Grove, Oregon 97116

TYPE OF REQUEST: Commercial Site Plan Approval (BMC 19.33)

REVIEW PROCEDURE: Type C-2

DECISION DATE: **May 31, 2011**

DECISION SUMMARY: **APPROVED, WITH CONDITIONS**

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The subject property is located at Hinkleman Extension Road, East and SR 410 in Buckley, WA 98321, on Parcel Number 5665000457.

ACREAGE: 1.23 acres

ZONING: General Commercial (GC)

UTILITIES: Water, Sewer, Stormwater, Gas, Fire: City of Buckley;
Electrical Power: Puget Sound Energy

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposal is to expand the existing assisted living center to include a memory care facility to house Alzheimer's patients. The facility will house 37 new patients with 11 daytime employees. Project improvements will include storm water management facilities, access road improvements, a 29-stall parking lot (adding 18 new parking stalls), and landscaping.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: *Approve, Subject to Conditions*

Based on all of the evidence in the record and being fully informed in the proceedings, the Hearing Examiner hereby enters the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision as proven by a preponderance of the evidence:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **The Record.** The official record for this proceeding consists of the Exhibits entered into evidence (Exhibits 1 through 24), as well as the testimony of witnesses received at the open record hearing. Exhibits 23 (Staff Recommendation) and 24 (the Sign-In Sheet from the Public Hearing) were marked as exhibits and added to the record by the Hearing Examiner at the public hearing. The entire record was admitted into evidence and considered by the Examiner in reaching the decision herein. A copy of the Exhibit List is attached to this Decision as Appendix A.

NOTE: For a complete record, an electronic recording of the hearing in this case is available in the Office of the City Clerk.

2. **Parties of Record.** The Parties of Record are set forth in the Parties of Record Register and include interested parties who testified at the open record hearing, along with parties (citizens and agencies) that sent in written comments to the City on or before the close of the record on issues relating to the project.
3. **Hearing Examiner Process.** The Hearing Examiner held an open record hearing on May 19, 2011, beginning at 6 p.m. at City Hall in the Multi-Purpose Room. Witnesses were sworn, testimony was presented, and exhibits were entered into the record at the hearing.
 - a. Dave Schmidt, City Administrator, Dominick Miller, City Engineer, and Kathy James, Planner, appeared on behalf of the City.
 - b. Marvin Pratt and Fred Murray, owners of Heritage House Buckley, LLC appeared on behalf of the Applicant, along with Peggy Jenson, staff of Heritage House Buckley.
 - c. No members of the public testified at the public hearing. (Exhibit 24)
4. **Determination of Completeness and Vesting.** The Applicant submitted an application for Commercial Site Plan Approval on January 20, 2011. (Exhibit 1) The application was determined to be complete for purposes of vesting on February 17, 2011. The City's determination of the date of completeness was made as required by BMC 20.01.030. (Exhibit 10)
5. **Site Description.** The site is approximately 1.23 acres in size, consisting of one undeveloped lot. The parcel is generally rectangular, with SR 410 to the south and Hinkleman Extension Road E on the east property line. The west property line is adjacent to the Heritage House Buckley's existing facility. The zoning of the property is General Commercial (GC). The surrounding properties consist of several different zoning types. The surrounding lots are zoned Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) to the north and GC to the south, east and west.

Summary of the Proposal. The applicant proposes to expand their existing assisted living center to include a memory care facility to house Alzheimer's patients. The facility will house 37 patients with 11 daytime employees. Project improvements will include stormwater management facilities, access road improvements, a 29-stall parking lot, and landscaping. Improvements are shown on the drawings prepared by RB Engineering. After developing this lot, the proposal is to

move the property line between the Memory Care Facility and SR 410 and integrate this area with the existing Heritage House parcel (Parcel Number 5665000456), creating a single lot of approximately 3.7-acres in size.

6. Application Notice. Notice of the Application was issued by the City on March 3, 2011. Notice of the application and SEPA determination was published in the City's official newspaper, the Enumclaw Courier Herald on March 9, 2011. Additionally, notice was sent via first class mail to residents within 300 feet of the site, and posted on the subject property and at all City posting sites on March 10, 2011. (Exhibits 12)
7. Hearing Notice. Notice of the open record hearing before the Hearing Examiner was given by the City Clerk as required by the Buckley Municipal Code on April 27, 2011. (Exhibit 20)
8. Environmental Review under SEPA. According to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and Chapter 12.04 BMC, the Applicant is required to complete a SEPA Checklist to identify any significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed development. The Applicant submitted a Final Revised SEPA Checklist on February 17, 2011. (Exhibit 9) As the SEPA responsible official, the Planning Director issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) on March 3, 2011. (Exhibit 12) Notice of the DNS was issued and comments were accepted until March 24, 2011. No SEPA appeals were received by the City. The Hearing Examiner finds that the required SEPA procedures were followed.
9. Criteria for Approval of a Site Plan. Each site plan application shall be reviewed for conformity with the standards and policies set forth in BMC 19.33.050. It states:

Fundamental land use planning choices made in adopted comprehensive and subarea plans and development regulations shall serve as the foundation for project review. During project review, the planning director or any subsequent reviewing body or designated official shall determine a proposed project's consistency with adopted development regulations and the appropriate elements of the Buckley comprehensive plan or subarea plan(s) adopted under Chapter 36.70A RCW giving consideration to issues such as but not limited to:

- a. The type of land use, including uses that may be allowed under certain circumstances, such as the residential cluster development and conditional and special uses, if the criteria for their approval have been satisfied;
- b. The level of development, such as units per acre or other measures of density if applicable;
- c. Infrastructure, including public facilities and services needed to serve the development, and availability and adequacy of public facilities identified in the Buckley comprehensive plan, if the plan or development regulations provide for funding of these facilities; and
- d. The characteristics of the development, such as development standards.

An analysis of the project's consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and development regulations is set forth below.

10. Consistency with the City's GMA Comprehensive Plan. In the City's Staff Report, the City performed an extensive analysis of the Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan that are applicable to the proposed development. The Hearing Examiner has reviewed the analysis and concurs with it and the conclusions reached by the staff in its report. As such, the Staff's analysis is incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full. (See, Exhibit 23 at pp. 8

through 12). Based on the entire record the Hearing Examiner finds that the proposed Heritage House Buckley, Memory Care Facility Commercial Site Plan application is consistent with the Goals and Policies of the City of Buckley's Comprehensive Plan.

11. Compliance with City Development Standards. In addition to achieving consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the development application must also comply with the City's development standards. The Examiner addresses each applicable standard in turn.
 - a. Critical Areas Regulations - Chapter 12.08 BMC. The subject property is flat and grassy. No wetlands, streams, geologically hazardous areas or other critical areas are on or near the site. As such, the requirements of the City's critical areas regulations are not applicable to the proposed site plan. (Exhibits 9, 23)
 - b. Grading and Filling (Land Disturbing Activities) – Chapter 16.01 BMC. The project proposes to re-grade approximately 1,730 cubic yards of soil and remove an additional 2,500 cubic yards of soil from the site. The applicant proposes to cut 708 feet and fill 713 feet of soil. A grading and drainage permit, as well as a Construction Stormwater General NPDES Permit obtained through the Department of Ecology, are required for this project. (Exhibits 6, 23)

The Applicant supplied a Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan Report (Exhibit 6). Upon completion of the project, the site will consist of 40,700 square feet of impervious surface. The applicant asserts that the project will not affect or impact the flow of stormwater across the property. The increased stormwater runoff emanating from the proposed parking and roof areas will be collected and conveyed to the proposed onsite stormwater treatment and detention system. Runoff will be released via an outlet control structure to the City's storm system located within the right of way of Hinkleman Extension Road East. All proposed storm systems have been designed in accordance with the 2005 DOE Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. (Exhibit 3) The temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) plan and preliminary drainage plan are adequately shown in the plan set. (See, Exhibit 5 at Sheets C.1.1, C.2.1 and C.2.2).

Stormwater drainage for the site is proposed in accordance with the City's Stormwater Regulations Ch. 14.30 thru 14.40 BMC, subject to the staff recommended conditions. Based on the revised proposed preliminary drainage plan and the foregoing facts, the Examiner finds that proposal meets the requirements of Ch. 16.01 BMC.

- c. Zoning – Chapter 19.20 BMC. The site is zoned GC and is surrounded by parcels zoned GC to the east, west, and south, and NMU to the north. The GC Zone is governed by the performance standards of BMC 19.20.070. In addition, the GC zone is subject to the City's Use Matrix, BMC 19.20.130 and bulk requirements set forth in Ch. 19.22 BMC.

BMC 19.20.010(2) establishes general requirements for all zones, including residential and commercial. Commercial zone requirements applicable to this application only pertain to building heights. BMC 19.20.010(2)(a) limits building heights to a maximum of 35 feet. The present application has identified that all structures will have a maximum height of 21 feet, which is below the limit established by City Code.

City staff reviewed the application for consistency with the performance standards of each individual zoning classification consisting of lot area, lot area coverage, dimensions, setbacks, off-street parking and standards for street and utility construction. Staff determined that development within the areas zoned GC met required performance standards for lot area, lot area coverage, dimensions and setbacks. (Requirements for off-street parking are reviewed separately, below).

In addition, the development will be conditioned to comply with BMC 17.08 "Standards for street and utility construction."

City staff reviewed the application for consistency with the permitted use requirements of BMC 19.20.130, and determined that the proposed use is permitted. Accordingly, the proposal meets the City's Zoning Use Matrix.

City staff reviewed the application for consistency with the "Bulk requirements" of Ch. 19.22 BMC and determined that based upon the submittals, and with the inclusion of the proposed conditions of approval, the application will meet the requirements of Ch. 19.29 BMC, "Landscaping" and Ch. 14.30 BMC, "Stormwater Management." Therefore, the application will comply with Ch. 19.22 BMC. (See, Exhibits 5, 6, and 21)

Based on the foregoing facts, and the project's compliance with Buckley Municipal Code Chapters 17.08, 19.28, 19.29 and 14.30, the site plan application complies with the City's Zoning Code.

- d. Off-Street Parking and Loading – Chapter 19.28 BMC The requirements for parking for the subject Memory Care Facility are not clearly stated within the City's Municipal Code. The parties acknowledged at the public hearing that parking requirements are driven by the use proposed in a development application, and that this facility did not easily fit within any of the adopted use types found in the Buckley Municipal Code. The project is not an "assisted living facility" or "nursing home," but rather a "memory care center" which has unique features. A memory care center is a secured site. The residents are mentally deficient and do not drive, cook or bathe independently. The Applicants testified at the public hearing, supported by Peggy Jenson, that people residing in memory care centers have fewer visitors than residents in other care facilities, such as assisted living facilities. Accordingly, the need for parking is mainly driven by staff working on site. The applicant has proposed to install 18 new parking stalls, which works for purposes of stormwater control. At the hearing, the City staff and Applicant agreed that if the Applicant should desire to change the use at the subject property through a new application, the amount of parking needed on site would be reconsidered. The Hearing Examiner has reviewed the application and the City's development regulations and finds that the facts support the addition of 18 new parking stalls.
- e. Landscaping – Chapter 19.29 BMC. Landscaping requirements for the proposed project are governed by Chapter 19.29 BMC. BMC 19.29.060 provides, among other things, that Façade Buffers, Barrier Buffers and Visual Relief Buffers are required for all new commercial buildings two units within the CC, GC, HDR, LI and NMU zones. Parking Lot Canopy Buffers are required to the interior of all parking lots which have 20 or more spaces. Here, the landscape plan was submitted at the public hearing. (Exhibit 21) The landscape plan is subject to review by staff and prior approval by the City's Design Review Committee (DRC). Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the

applicant shall obtain approval of its submitted landscape plans in conformance with Chapter 19.29 BMC.

f. SR 410 Design District – Chapter 19.51 BMC. The subject property is located along SR 410, which is subject to the requirements of the SR 410 Design District, Chapter 19.51 BMC, and the Guidelines for Development, as well as the DRC requirements. The project was reviewed by the City's DRC on April 11, 2011. The proposal does not yet meet their requirements. Outstanding issues will be addressed and can be remedied prior to design committee approval.

12. Based on the entire record, the foregoing Findings of Fact, and subject to the proposed Conditions of approval, the Examiner finds that the proposed site plan application for a Commercial Site Plan will meet the City's development standards and zoning regulations. As a result, the application meets the review criteria set forth in BMC 19.33.050.
13. Any Finding of Fact that should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction to consider the subject application pursuant to BMC 20.01.030 and BMC 20.01.100(8).
2. The Applicant's application for site plan approval was deemed to be complete on February 17, 2011, and the application was vested to the laws and regulations in effect on that date.
3. Notice of the application was properly given as required by BMC 20.01.140 and BMC 20.01.100.
4. Notice of the public hearing on the request for preliminary subdivision approval was properly given as required by BMC 20.01.100.
5. Review of the project pursuant to SEPA was properly accomplished and no appeals of the DNS were received. The Hearing Examiner concludes that the requirements of SEPA have been met.
6. Pursuant to BMC 20.01.100(a), the Hearing Examiner concludes that the proposed site plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the requirements and intent of the City's zoning regulations and applicable design and development standards.
7. Adequate public services and utilities exist to serve the proposed development.
8. The application for site plan approval, with the imposition of the recommended conditions, is not detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare.
9. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Hearing Examiner concludes that the site plan application should be approved with conditions.
10. Any Conclusion in this Final Decision and Order, which should be deemed a Finding of Fact, is hereby adopted as such.

DECISION

The Heritage House Buckley, LLC, Memory Care Facility Site Plan is **APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:**

CONDITIONS:

A. General Requirements

1. In accordance with the DAHP letter dated May 10, 2011, if archaeological materials are observed during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity shall stop and the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), City of Buckley, and affected Indian Tribes shall be contacted immediately. In addition, if any human remains are observed, in addition to the requirements above, the immediate area shall be secured and local law enforcement, the Pierce County medical examiner, and State Physical Anthropologist, DAHP, shall also be contacted.
2. Prior to construction permit issuance, the City Fire Department shall confirm that adequate hydrant coverage is available for the proposed building.
3. Permits, fees and bonds shall be required for improvements within public rights-of-way and on-site stormwater and utility systems. Performance Bonds and Warranty Bonds, in accordance with City requirements will be followed by maintenance bonds after installation is complete. The bonds shall be an amount 150 percent of the estimated cost of installing or maintaining the improvement, as approved by the city engineer.
4. A boundary line adjustment shall be performed to include all parking stalls on one lot, or a variance for parking stall locations shall be obtained.

B. Parking

1. The applicant shall add 18 new parking stalls to serve the Memory Care Facility.
2. A bike rack shall be placed in a protected area for use by visitors and employees.
3. The backout/turnaround at the west end of the nine new parking stalls shall be similar to the west end of the existing parking.

C. Landscaping

1. Landscaping shall be placed on the property in accordance with BMC 19.29 and the Guidelines for Redevelopment adopted under BMC 19.20.50.060. If required by staff, a landscape plan meeting the requirements of BMC 19.29 shall be re-submitted prior to issuance of construction permits and shall include the following:
 - a. Submittal requirements in accordance with BMC 19.29.050
 - b. Façade buffers to soften the transition between the streets and the building.

- c. Barrier buffers on the interior side property lines (north and west) in accordance with BMC 19.29.060(2).
- d. Visual relief buffers shall include a 10-foot wide landscape strip next to the streets in accordance with BMC 19.29.060(3)
- e. Parking lot canopy barriers shall provide a 50 percent canopy coverage within 10 years of planting in accordance with BMC 19.29.060(4).
- f. Street trees shall be provided between the property line and the curb edges along SR 410 and Hinkleman Extension in accordance with BMC 19.29.060(5).
- g. The new parking stalls on Parcel 5665000456 shall be screened from SR 410.

D. Design

1. Prior to building permit issuance, the Design Review Committee must approve a development and/or design plan for this proposal.

E. Construction Plans

1. The building height shall be identified on the plans.
2. Existing channelization on Hinkleman Road should be shown and labeled on the plans.
3. Per BMC 20.01.120, the site plan shall show and identify all easements, deeds, restrictions, or other encumbrances restricting the use of the property, if applicable.
4. Per BMC 19.33.030(1), the drawings shall include the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the recorded owner or owners and, if applicable, the names, addresses and telephone numbers of any architect, planner, surveyor, designer or engineer responsible for the preparation of the plan, and of any authorized representative of the applicant.
5. On Sheet C1.1 under Project information, the percentage of impervious site coverage shall be included.
6. Per BMC 19.33.030(4)(m), traffic volumes and flows estimated to be generated by the proposed development on adjacent roads shall be indicated on the plans or application.
7. Per BMC 19.33.030(4)(r), a sign plan drawn to scale showing the location, size, design, material, color, and method of illumination of all exterior signs shall be included in the plans.

F. Water/Sewer Utilities

1. *Computations and other data used for design of the sewer system shall be submitted for City approval. The design elements of the sewer system shall conform to Section 6 of the City of Buckley Development Guidelines and Public Works Standards and follow design guidelines as set forth in the Department of Ecology's "Criteria for Sewer Design" manual.*

2. The size and material of the existing and proposed utilities shall be labeled on the drawings.
3. A 15-foot wide easement shall be dedicated to the City to encompass the hydrant run and relocated hydrant.
4. A double check valve assembly shall be provided for the domestic water service.
5. Supporting calculations showing that the existing storm facilities will carry the nine additional stalls and associated impervious in front of the existing facility shall be provided; or new treatment and detention facilities shall be provided.

G. Frontage Improvements

1. Per BMC 17.08.050, the filing of any application for a building permit shall require the applicant to dedicate land and/or make public improvements reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development, including but not limited to frontage improvements (Ordinance 47-98) and per BMC 19.20.010(2)(d) for commercial zones, full street frontage improvements shall be required. Based on existing conditions, frontage improvements will be required on SR 410 abutting the property. The frontage improvements will consist of a meandering sidewalk and a landscaping strip.
2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy (temporary or permanent) for the new building, the applicant shall either: a) complete the frontage improvements along SR 410, OR b) complete a boundary line adjustment (approved by the City and recorded with the County) such that development on the revised corner lot has not occurred.
3. The applicant shall clarify if a boundary line adjustment is proposed to be completed prior to implementation of the commercial site plan

H. Clearing, Grading and Erosion Control

1. *Prior to any construction activities, approval shall be gained by the city engineer for the Clearing, Grading, Erosion Control, and Utilities construction plans.*
2. *Prior to any construction or land-disturbing activities, approved sedimentation and erosion control measures shall be installed and shall remain in place until the City Engineer approves removal.*
3. *All applicable stormwater management regulations shall be complied with pursuant to the Buckley Municipal Code Section 14.30.*

4. Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water pollution control, and WAC 173-201A, Water quality standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action.
5. Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soil and other pollutants into surface water or storm drains that lead to waters of the state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soil will damage aquatic habitat and are considered to be pollutants.
6. This project may require a construction stormwater permit (also known as a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit and a State Waste Discharge General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction). This permit is required for projects that meet both of the following conditions:
 - a. One or more acres of soil surface area will be disturbed by construction activities.
 - b. The site already has offsite discharge to waters of the state or storm drains or will have offsite discharge during construction.

1. Stormwater and Water Quality Control

1. Regarding the submitted stormwater information:
 - a. A Construction Stormwater General Permit, obtained through the Department of Ecology will be required for this project.
 - b. The detention system shall meet all access requirements of Detention Tanks listed in the 2005 DOE Manual, including but not limited to, "Access openings should be positioned a maximum of 50 feet from any location within the tank," and "Tanks must comply with the OSHA confined space requirements."
 - c. The detention facility was modeled in the WWHM as a vault. This does not accurately reflect the geometry of the proposed detention system and accordingly, the discharge rate/head condition for a given volume. Because modeling the system as a vault and supplying the overall volume with the proposed system is conservative as far as the resulting flow out the system, this is acceptable. The system could likely be optimized by modeling it as a tank with the bottom elevation at a depth appropriate to the geometry.
2. If new parking stalls are placed on the lot currently developed with Heritage House, engineering studies shall verify that the additional impervious area on the existing site will be adequately treated and detained in accordance with current requirements.

Issued this 31ST day of May, 2011.

CITY OF BUCKLEY
Buckley, Washington



Millie M. Judge, Hearing Examiner

DISTRIBUTION:

All Parties of Record

City Clerk

Members of the City Council

PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL

Effective Date of Decision. According to BMC 20.01.250(2), the final decision of the hearing examiner **shall be effective on the date stated in the decision**; provided, that the appeal periods shall be calculated from the date of issuance of the land use decision, as provided in the Land Use Petition Act, Chapter 36.70C RCW. For the purposes of this chapter, the date on which a land use decision is issued is:

- (a) Three days after a written decision is mailed by the city, or, if not mailed, the date on which the city provides notice that a written decision is publicly available;
- (b) If the land use decision is made by ordinance or resolution by the city council sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity, the date the city council passes the ordinance or resolution;
- (c) If neither subsection (2)(a) nor (b) of this section applies, the date the decision is entered into the public record.

BMC 20.01.260(8) Appeals. Appeals from the final decision of the hearing examiner on Type C-2 procedures (subject to timely exhaustion of all administrative remedies) shall be made to Pierce County Superior Court **within 21 calendar days** of the date the decision or action becomes final, as defined in BMC 20.01.250(2), unless another time period is established by state law or local ordinance. All appeals must conform to the requirements and procedures set forth in Chapter 36.70C RCW (the Land Use Petition Act).

The cost of transcribing and preparing all records ordered certified by the court or desired by the appellant for such appeal shall be borne by the appellant. Prior to the preparation of any records, the appellant shall post with the city clerk an advance fee deposit in the amount specified by the city clerk. Any overage will be promptly returned to the appellant.

APPENDIX A

Exhibit List	Date Received
1. Application CSP-2011-01 (site plan review)	January 20, 2011
2. Applications CR-2011-01 (design review)	January 20, 2011
3. Project narrative	January 20, 2011
4. Reduced building elevations	January 20, 2011
5. Reduced site plan set (C1.1, C2.1, and C2.2)	January 20, 2011
6. RB Engineering Preliminary stormwater site plan report	January 20, 2011
7. Comment: E-mail from city engineer Dom Miller stating sufficient information is in the application for review	February 10, 2011
8. Comment: E-mail from fire chief Al Predmore stating no comments at this time	February 11, 2011
9. REVISED SEPA checklist	February 17, 2011
10. Letter of complete application	February 17, 2011
11. Comment: Review letter from city engineer Dom Miller	March 3, 2011
12. Notice of application and DNS with published notice	March 3, 2011
13. Revised parking plan showing 29 additional stalls and landscaping	March 17, 2011
14. Comment: Tacoma Pierce County Health Department stating no objections to the proposal	March 17, 2011
15. LOS statement from city engineer	March 18, 2011
16. Comment: Department of Ecology, regarding water quality	March 24, 2011
17. Comment: Department of Archeology & Historic Preservation, regarding Site # 45PI197; Log # 0323110-09-PI	March 24, 2011
18. Comment: Pierce Transit with transit stop location correction; one is 500 feet to south	March 24, 2011
19. Report: Drayton Archaeological Assessment of the Heritage House Memory Care Facility dated April 21, 2011	April 25, 2011
20. Notice: Public hearing notice for May 19, 2011	April 27, 2011

Exhibit List	Date Received
21. Revised Landscaping Plan and three photographs	May 19, 2011
22. Revised [Proposed] Condition A.1 – Letter from DAHP re: Archaeological Resources and Inadvertent Discovery	May 11, 2011
23. Staff Recommendation	April 28, 2011
24. Public Hearing Sign-In Sheet	May 19, 2011